



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/924,785	09/05/1997	RICHARD W. PRATT	785	4422

7590 05/01/2002  
D'ALESSANDRO & RITCHIE  
P.O. BOX 640640  
SAN JOSE, CA 95164-0640

EXAMINER

PRIETO, BEATRIZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 05/01/2002

29

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

08/924,785

Applicant(s)

PRATT, RICHARD W.

Examiner

B. PRIETO

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02/20/02.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is in response to request for reconsideration filed 02/20/02, claims 1-46 remain pending.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 112**

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In this case, (i) distinct claim elements: the "network device", and the "remote device", its indefinite if these devices are intended to be the same or different as claimed, or plural "remote network device" or one "remote network device". For the purposes of examination, although not required by the claim language, it is presumed the later, i.e. claim 1 only makes reference to one, i.e. the same "remote network device".

(ii) distinct claim elements: "network device control software program", and "the software program", its indefinite if these programs are intended to be the same or different as claimed, or plural "network device control software", or each refer to the same "network device control software program". For the purposes of examination, although not required by the claim language, it is presumed the later, i.e. each refer to one, i.e. the same "network device control software program".

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

4. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action may be found in previous office action.

5. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan et. al. (Hogan) U.S. Patent No. 5,778,368 in view of Palay U.S. Patent No. 5,613,120.

Regarding claim 1, Hogan teaches a system/method comprising repository units comprising;

software programs (col 17/lines 10-41, comprising software program files for controlling <sup>(target computer)</sup> network devices, software program files including binary software utility programs, col 20/lines 34-52, ~~device software code, col 6/lines 28-32~~), and <sup>REPOSITORY UNITS</sup>

embedded software files <sup>INCLUDED IN</sup> forming a repository unit (col 7/lines 25-34, said <sup>REPOSITORY</sup> unit built using a compiler/linker/loader col 11/lines 32-33),

said repository unit may be downloaded to a network <sup>(target comp)</sup> device (downloadable to a <sup>operating systems</sup> network device, col 7/lines 54-65, download to <sup>(target comp)</sup> configure network device col 9/lines 17-36);

said repository unit is transmitted over a network to a remote client (9) machine <sup>(client's)</sup> location, col 11/lines 1-13, downloading, col 8/lines 27-43, 59-col 9/lines 13, downloading over a network); <sup>9/17-36</sup>

enable said remote client's machine to remotely configure the network <sup>(target comp)</sup> device (configure the network device to have functionalities of the source machine col 9/lines 3-13, configuring network devices with associated software programs, col 17/lines 14-47); the repository unit including;

establishing a communications link between the remote client and software program, where said software programs (e.g. software utility programs) in the downloadable unit establishing a link operation with the embedded software an allows the user via interface means to interface and interact with the embedded software, perform the task of the embedded software and has means for connecting with multiple application (Hogan col 21/lines 1-10);

component for enabling a user to communicate with said repository unit (user interface means to enabling communication between the user and said unit, col 20/lines 34-52, interface for managing (e.g. control to perform specific functions) and configuring the network device, col 5/lines 12-15, i.e. the functional network device, col 8/lines 15-24), and

component for managing and configuring the remote device (configuration files for configuring and managing network devices col 17/lines 11-41, configure and manage said network device, col 20/lines 53-67 to specific perform functions);

component for loading said repository unit onto a network device (loading on network device, col 14/lines 1-6, component loader for checkout source code, col 16/lines 2-3, download utility file, col 17/lines 13-15);

however Hogan does not explicitly teach embedding software (downloadable unit) into the binary file of a compiled software program,

Palay teaches embedding software classes in an object file generated by a compiler from a source file, (embedding class instances col 8/lines 56-67 in a object file produced by a compiler from a source file, col 12/lines 6-25, classes information is class instances of the method, source file is a program, col 7/lines 34-40);

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include compiling the software program into binary files generated by a compiler's output, as taught by Palay, supporting compiler/link/loader tool, taught by Hogan, to compile a source program file generating a source program binary file, embed a class instance in said binary file forming a unit downloadable on the network device, motivation would be to make these units are independent of specific architecture of platform of the computer system where they are to be executed, enabling the modification of class method definitions and implementations without the need for recompilations isolating the classes without imposing performance penalty and without limiting the software language being used.

6. Claims 2, 4-15, 19-28, 30-38, 40-43, and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan et. al. (Hogan) U.S. Patent No. 5,778,368 in view of Palay U.S. Patent No. 5,613,120 in further view of Lindholm U.S. Patent No. 5,859,982.

Regarding claims 2 and 4, further downloadable unit includes more than one unit (Hogan: a combination of software program and embedded software, col 7/lines 62-65, downloading units, col 13/lines 51-65), however the above teachings does not explicitly teach wherein said downloadable unit includes embedding Java™ class;

Lindholm teaches where downloadable unit includes embedding Java™ class (Lindholm, col 1/lines 39-65, col 5/lines 34-59, Java™ classes, col 4/lines 47-56);

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include embedding Java™ class in said downloadable units, supported by Palay's teachings of embedding software classes in a binary file, software source files independent of the

programming language used, motivation would be further enhance downloadable units making them independent of the specific architecture or platform of the target device, enabling these to be directly loaded into the memory in run-time, freeing target device from handling the cycle of installation, configuration upgrade typical of software products.

Regarding claims 5-6, bundling more than one downloadable unit into a downloadable unit bundle (Hogan: bundle: col 7/lines 41-46, loader: col 11/lines 32-33), building downloadable units according to a function (Hogan: col 10/lines 24-36).

Regarding claims 7-8, bundling more than one downloading unit according to a version (Hogan: col 9/lines 40-54), bundling sharable downloadable units into a default bundle (Hogan: col 8/lines 43-52).

Regarding claim 9, software programs include operating system executing on the network device (Hogan: col 7/lines 54-64).

Regarding claim 10-11, network device includes a router (Hogan: col 17/lines 1-25), created table of contents for the downloadable unit bundle (Hogan: col 13/lines-col 14/line 8).

Regarding claim 12, embedding downloadable unit into a binary file (Hogan: col 7/lines 28-34, Lindholm, embedded software col 18/lines 12-22 into a binary file readily executed on a remote client device col 4/lines 15-col 6/line 4, col 12/lines 29-43).

Regarding claim 13, as discussed on claim 1 and additionally,

software program comprising an utility software program compiled into a binary utility files to be downloaded to the network device (e.g. binary software utility programs include in the repository units, col 20/lines 34-52), downloaded units for managing the network device (configuration files for configuring and managing network devices col 17/lines 11-41, configure and manage network device to emulate environment (i.e. software functionalities) on said network device, col 20/lines 53-67).

a web server (A) for communicating with the remote client (9) and for transmitting the embedded downloadable unit to the remote client in response to said remote client's request

(access via said server, col 9/lines 16-36), receiving from a remote client for downloadable units, downloadable units comprising software programs for managing network devices, said software programs including binary utility software program (Hogan: software programs col 17/lines 10-41, comprising software files for controlling and configuring network devices, embedded software col 7/lines 25-34 or any combination of files, to form a repository unit, built using a compiler/linker/loader col 11/lines 32-33, i.e. loading by the loader the binary file from the compiler of software programs e.g. binary software utility programs include in the repository units, col 20/lines 34-52, and linked by the linker with the embedded software, to form a repository unit).

Regarding claim 14-15, and 17, these claims are the system associated with the method disclosed on claims 10, 2 and 5, respectively same rationale is applicable.

Regarding claim 18, downloadable units have been combined into downloadable unit bundles (Hogan: col 7/lines 28-34).

Regarding claim 19-22, these claims describe the system associated with the method discussed on claims 6-7, 9-10, respectively same rationale is applicable.

Regarding claims 23-24, the web server communicated with the remote client using an Internet file transfer protocol (Hogan: col 8/lines 59-col 9/line 3), web server communicates with the remote client using an Internet protocol (Hogan: col 8/lines 59-col 9/line 6, web server protocols, col 11/lines 14-17)

Regarding claim 25, the software includes an extractor for extracting the embedded software and software programs comprising the downloadable units (Hogan; un-packer col 7/lines 41-46, check-out application, col 15/lines 64-67).

Regarding claim 26, software programs are currently executing on the network device (Hogan: col 12/lines 11-25).

Regarding claim 27, the claim comprises the system consisting of the means for performing the method claimed on claim 1, same rationale is applicable.

Regarding claim 28, this claim is substantially the same limitation discussed on claims 2, and 15, same rationale is applicable.

Regarding claim 30, this claim is substantially the same limitation discussed on claims 5, and 17, same rationale is applicable.

Regarding claim 31, this claim is substantially the same limitation discussed on claims 17-18, same rationale is applicable.

Regarding claim 32, this claim is substantially the same limitation discussed on claims 21, and 26, same rationale is applicable.

Regarding claim 33, this claim is substantially the same limitation discussed on claims 10, and 14, same rationale is applicable.

Regarding claims 34-35, establishing a communication link includes using a URL and opening an Internet connection (Hogan: col 8/lines 59-col 9/line 6, HTTP-based communication link, selecting from a web page, col 9/lines 14-26, CGI/server html accessed-based, col 11/lines 20-24, col 7/lines 50-53, where a user clicks, col 14/lines 56-col 15/line 13).

Regarding claim 36, claim is substantially the same as claim 23, as discussed, same rationale is applicable.

Regarding claim 37, communication link includes a web engine (Hogan: col 11/lines 14-24, web server engine).

Regarding claim 38, Java™ virtual machine (Lindholm, col 5/lines 34-59).

Regarding claims 40 and 43, substantially the same as discussed above on claims, additionally,

locating a downloadable unit which corresponds to the request (Hogan search result of requested downloadable units, col 14/lines 9-col 15/line 13), downloadable unit including: software



programs, col 17/lines 10-41, embedded software, col 7/lines 25-34, software programs including binary software utility programs, col 11/lines 32-33, col 20/lines 34-52, linked with the embedded software), as discussed above,

software program within downloadable unit, enables user to perform request (Hogan: user interface to enabling communication between the user and the downloadable units, col 20/lines 34-52, interface for managing (e.g. control to perform specific functions) and configuring the network device, col 5/lines 12-15, repository station, i.e. the functional (client) network device, col 8/lines 15-24),

extracting the downloadable unit from the binary file and forwarding the downloadable unit to the remote client for storage on said remote client (Hogan: select contents of downloadable unit, col 16/lines 61-62, contents of said unit including binary files, (Hogan: binary software utility programs include in the repository units, col 20/lines 34-52, downloads and unpacks, col 8/lines 59-col 9/line, forwarding to remote client computer).

Regarding claim 41, this is the system and means associated with the method discussed on claim 40, same rationale is applicable.

Regarding claim 42 this is the computer-storage medium storing the program code for performing the method on claim 40, same rationale is applicable.

Regarding claim 45-46, software program includes a list of available functions and downloadable units (Hogan: col 13/lines-col 14/line 8).

7. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan-Palay in view of Lindholm U.S. Patent No. 5,859,982 in further view of Nakagawa et. al. (Nakagawa) U.S. Patent No. 5,832,911.

Regarding claim 44, substantially the same as discussed on claims 1, 13, 27, 40, 41, 42, and 43, further the above teachings do not explicitly each receiving a new downloadable unit, retrieving an old downloadable unit comprising, as discussed above an embedded software in a software program binary file, and substituting an old downloadable unit with a new downloadable unit, and

loading said new downloadable unit comprising new embedded software and new software program binary file;

Nakagawa teaches a system/method related to software distribution/maintenance with which a software distributors can provide and update for a number of users software/services over a network, for systematically distributed/maintained, re-installing and upgrading via a network connecting many distributor and users of client/server software, wherein a client program automatically updates the software to the latest version according to the update instruction information when it is received (Nakagawa: col 1/line 13-col 5/line 10, abstract), disclosing means for retrieving the network device control software program binary file having an embedded old downloadable unit for performing an old service from a network device (Nakagawa: col 22/lines 35-62);

It would be obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to to modify exist system with means for retrieving the network device control software program binary file having an embedded old downloadable unit for performing an old service from a network device, as taught by Nakagawa, motivation would be to further enhance existing means for adding, upgrading services to include a software distribution and maintenance means obtainable over a network for other various types of software such as product software, shareware, embedded software, freeware, scientific prototype software, intra-office software, etc, in an immediately operable form.

8. Claims 3, 16, 29 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan-Palay-Lindholm in view of Nakagawa et. al. (Nakagawa) U.S. Patent No. 5,832,911 in further view of Gish U.S. Patent 5,768,510.

Regarding claim 3, 16, 29, and 39, however the above teachings do not explicitly teach wherein the step of obtaining a downloadable unit includes embedding ActiveX™ control and associated browser capabilities;

Gish teaches a system/method distributed computer system comprising client computer software, server computer and a network for connecting the client computer to the server computer which utilize an execution software code configured to couple the server computer and the client computer via the network, disclosing means for obtaining downloading units (applets) using ActiveX™ control technology for embedding software into downloadable units installing and

configuring associated browser capabilities (Gish: col 15/line-col 16/line 8, col 16/lines 54-col 17/line 10);

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify existing system with means for obtaining a downloadable unit includes embedding ActiveX™ control and associated browser capabilities, as taught by Gish, motivation extend functionalities existing in Java (applets) technology to similar functions provided by ActiveX technologies, to give developers/designers to manufacture dynamic content for the Internet and network devices that work on multiple platforms, and are being widely supported, these small, fast components that enable developers to embed parts of software supported by a variety of programming languages, where one of ordinary skill in the art readily recognizes that ActiveX™ could be substituted for JAVA without undue experimentation to practice the invention.

### ***Response to arguments***

9. Applicant argues (A), prior art of record Hogan nor Lindholm are not in the same field of endeavor as instant application because Hogan does not teach managing a network device from a remote client.

In response to A, instant application related to the transmission of embedded software to a remote device, the execution of the transmitted software enables device to be managed and configured. Hogan teaches among many application to his teachings, downloading software, embedded software or a combination of these to remote network target devices, where when said that when executed on remote network target device said device configured on managed by means of said loaded software, as discussed above, in this aspect Hogan is found to be in same field of endeavor of instant application.

10. Applicant argues (B), there is not motivation the combine the prior arts of record Lindholm with Hogan because Lindholm is designed to solved problems that unlikely support any modification of or combination with the Hogan reference.

In response to Hogan relates to the transmission of embedded software over the network and executing on a network device. Lindholm teachings relate to the execution of software

transmitted over the network, in this manner prior are found to be related to the transmission/execution of software programs over the network.

11. Applicant argues (C), prior art of record both Hogan and Lindholm fail to each software that in embedded in a binary file of a software program as claimed.

Moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Prieto, B.** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-0750**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 3:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, **Mark H. Rinehart** can be reached on **(703) 305-4815**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **(703) 308-6606**. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3800/4700**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:  
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239, (for Official communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-7240 (for Non-Official or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist), further ensuring that a receipt is provided stamped "TC 2100".



B. Prieto  
Patent Examiner  
April 26, 2002

MEHMET B. GECKIL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

